

# EXHIBIT 2

## Whitley, David

---

**From:** Armand Derfner <aderfner@dawlegal.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 28, 2014 8:17 AM  
**To:** Brandy\_Cortez@txs.uscourts.gov; Westfall, Elizabeth (CRT)  
**Cc:** Amy Rudd; Baldwin, Anna (CRT); D'Andrea, Arthur; Ben Addison Donnell; Gear, Bruce (CRT); Chad Dunn; Christina Swarns; Freeman, Daniel (CRT); Danielle Conley; Whitley, David; Duel Ross; Emma Simson; Erandi Zamora; Ezra Rosenberg; Jose Garza; Gerard Sinzdak; M. Hasan Ali; J. Gerald Hebert; Maranzano, Jennifer (CRT); Roscetti, Jennifer; Jennifer Clark; Jose Garza; Smith, John A. (USATXS); Scott, John; Mitchell, Jonathan; Jonathan Paikin; Kelly Dunbar; Leah Aden; Wolf, Lindsey; Luis Roberto Vera, Jr.; Lynn Eisenberg; Mark Posner; Marinda van Dalen; Myrna Perez; Neil Baron; Natasha Korgaonkar; Peter McGraw; Preston Edward Henrichson; Robert W Doggett; Clay, Reed; Ryan Haygood; Dellheim, Richard (CRT); Richard Shordt; Keister, Ronny; Rolando Rios; King, Ryan (CRT); Kembel Scott Brazil; Sonia Kaur Gill; Sonya Lebsack; Vishal Agraharkar; Wendy Weiser  
**Subject:** Veasey v. Perry

I am re-sending the following e-mail to insure that all addressees receive it.

Dear Ms. Cortez:

An emergency issue has just arisen involving defendants' attempt to block release of a portion of the long-awaited database production, which is scheduled for this Friday, May 30. We private plaintiffs learned of the issue secondhand from DOJ yesterday afternoon (Tuesday) and have requested that Texas inform us of its position immediately, because the issue affects which database fields the private plaintiffs will receive. We have still not received a response, but the parties will need an emergency hearing with the Court if we cannot come to an agreement today. If such a hearing is necessary, it is critical to have it, if at all possible, before Friday.

Based on our understanding of the issue from DOJ, defendants object to the United States releasing to private plaintiffs and plaintiff-intervenors any fields of the election database that were not actually used in the matching process. These fields include data such as county code, county name, some fields related to full addresses, precinct codes, voters' former last names, and Spanish surname, among others. Some of these other fields are needed for further analyses of the "no-match" group. These fields (2012 version) were produced to all parties during the Section 5 case, and there is no reason why the fields should not be produced now.

Again, we apologize for the suddenness of this request, but we wanted to alert the Court that an emergency hearing may be needed tomorrow, May 29, if possible, to prevent delaying the production of the database match results for all parties, to prevent the private plaintiffs' receiving only part of the data they were to receive, and to limit the record that the Court will have for deciding this case.

Thank you.

Armand Derfner, one of counsel for the Veasqey LULAC plaintiffs.  
843-696-7935 (cell) or 843-722-6467